



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/259,427	02/26/1999	MARSHALL A. SLOO	27080	5283

7590 05/19/2004

THOMAS B LUEBBERING
HOVEY WILLIAMS TIMMONS & COLLINS
2405 GRAND BOULEVARD
SUITE 400
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NGA B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3628

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/259,427

Applicant(s)

SLOO, MARSHALL A.

Examiner

Nga B. Nguyen

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the communication filed on December 9, 2003, which paper has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claim 1-20 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments/Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8, 11, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott Maier, the Seattle Post Intelligencer (or Alex Rodriguez, Chicago sun Times), in view of Carlos Campos, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution (or Stockweather et al., Business Wire).

Regarding to claim 1, Maier or Rodriguez discloses a computer-based method of collecting and processing incidents observed by witnesses comprising the steps of: receiving into a computer system an incident report directly from a witness who observed an incident; and prompting the witness to provide certain types of information

about the incident (Maier, pages 1, 3; or Rodriguez, page 2; web pages allow citizens with computers at home fill out incident reports).

Maier or Rodriguez does not disclose selecting an authority to whom the incident report should be sent, wherein the authority is selected based at least in part on information provided by the witness and sending the incident report to the selected authority so that the authority can respond to the incident report. However, Campos or Stockweather discloses selecting an authority to whom the incident report should be sent, wherein the authority is selected based at least in part on information provided by the witness and sending the incident report to the selected authority so that the authority can respond to the incident report (see entire documents, the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system automatically selects the authority depending on the nature of the call of the witness and sends the incident information to the selected authority). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the features taught by Campos or Stockweather above with Maier or Rodriguez for the purpose of time consuming because the authority is automatically selected by the computer system, thus providing the authority with timely information that can be utilized to quickly solve the ongoing crimes.

Regarding to claim 2, Maier discloses the incident being selected from the group consisting of a criminal act, a legal violation, a sale of a defective product, and a rendering of an unsatisfactory service (page 1, drug dealers, murdered; page 3, illegal sale of guns to youths, being raped, robbed, stabbed, beaten, murdered).

Regarding to claim 3, Maier or Rodriguez does not directly teach prompting the witness to enter into the incident report identification information identifying the offender. However, Maier teach citizens can file online crime reports using the web page. Moreover, it is well known to include the identification information identifying the

offender in the crime report. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the identification the offender in the crime report in Maier or Rodriguez's crime reports for the purpose of providing the offender information to the authority, in order to assist the authority to solve crimes.

Regarding to claims 4-6, Maier and Campos do not disclose receiving additional identification information identifying the offender and adding the additional identification information to the incident report; the additional information being obtained by searching files accessible by the computer system or receiving from the authority based on the identification information entered by the witness. However, it is well known in the art to receive additional information about the offender by searching the computer system or receiving from the authority. For example, a police officer can obtain more information about the offender by searching the computer database or receives from the other resource such as individuals, groups of influence in the community or organizations, etc.... Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature above in Maier modified by Campos for the purpose of providing more information about the offender in order to quickly solve ongoing crimes.

Regarding to claim 7, Campos or Stockweather discloses the authority is automatically selected by the computer system based on information entered into the incident report by the witness (see claim 1 above for details).

Regarding to claim 8, Maier discloses the authority is selected by the witness (page 3, the web page includes Sheriff e-mail address, thus citizens can report the incident directly to the Sheriff via the e-mail).

Regarding to claim 11, Maier or Rodriguez discloses incident reports from a plurality of different witnesses are received in the computer system (Maier, pages 1, 3; or Rodriguez, page 2; web pages allow citizens with computers at home fill out incident reports).

Claims 17, 18 contain the same limitations found in claims (1, 3), 7, respectively, therefore are rejected by the same rationale.

6. Claims 9, 10, 12-16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott Maier, the Seattle Post Intelligencer (or Alex Rodriguez, Chicago sun Times), in view of Carlos Campos, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution (or Stockweather et al., Business Wire), and further in view of Colgan, U.S. Patent No. 5,510,978.

Regarding to claims 9,10, Colgan discloses the features not taught by Maier and Campos, receiving into the computer system an action report from the authority explaining the action the authority took in response to the incident report and storing the action report along with the incident report in a file accessible by the computer system (column 17, lines 31-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature above in Maier modified by Campos for the purpose of providing more convenient to the authority to access the crime information in the computer system in order to assist the authority to solve crimes.

Regarding to claims 12-14, Colgan discloses the features not taught by Maier and Campos, storing the incident reports in a searchable database, permitting persons

to access the searchable database to view the incident reports (column 16, lines 25-55), and receiving additional incident information from the persons that access the searchable database and adding the additional incident information to the incident reports to assist the authorities to solve crimes (column 17, lines 9-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the features above in Maier modified by Campos for the purpose of for the purpose of providing more convenient to the authority to retrieve crime information in the computer system in order to assist the authority to solve crimes.

Regarding to claims 15,16, Maier, Campos and Colgan do not disclose sending the additional identification information to the witness and prompting the witness to update the incident report based on the additional identification information. However, contacting the witness to receiving more information about the offender is well known, moreover, conventional electronic message allows people to send and receive messages over the computer network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature above with Maier modified by Campos and Colgan for the purpose of allowing the witness to receive and update information in order to assist the authority to solve crimes.

Claims 19, 20 contains the same limitations found in claims 9, (1, 3, 7, 9, 12), respectively, therefore, are rejected by the same rationale.

Conclusion

7. Claims **1-20** are rejected.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-2901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough can be reached on (703) 308-0505.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-1113.

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
C/o Technology Center 3600
Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9326 (for formal communication intended for entry),

or

(703) 308-3691 (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Seventh Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/259,427
Art Unit: 3628

Page 8

Nga B. Nguyen

Nga Nguyen

May 14, 2004